No. 323

The Christian News-Letter

Edited by KATHLEEN BLISS

HOLDEN LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

27th October, 1948

NEWS-LETTER

THE LAMBETH CONFERENCE AND THE BRITISH ASSOCIATION

SUPPLEMENT

WE ARE MEN AND NOT GOD
BY
REINOLD NIEBUHR

IN CONTRAST with the first Assembly of the World Council of Churches, which met in the full blare of publicity, the Lambeth Conference, consisting of over 300 bishops of the Anglican Communion from all parts of the world, carried on its deliberations for five weeks behind closed doors. No one who is not a bishop could write about it with the inside knowledge of an active participant.

The Report[1] consists of an encyclical letter, 118 resolutions on various subjects and the reports of five committees. A document of this kind does not easily lend itself to treatment in the Christian News-Letter. While we were debating in our minds how to deal with it in our limited space, the British Association for the Advancement of Science met at Brighton and opened with a brilliant address by its President, Sir Henry Tizard, on the place of science in the world to-day. Here, it seemed to us, was an inviting comparison. How are the respective themes and interests of the two meetings related to one another?

It would, of course, be wrong to represent the two gatherings as necessarily in opposition. Some of the members of the British Association are no doubt practising Christians. The bishops, on their side, have put into their Report more than one emphatic statement that Christianity welcomes the results of scientific investigation and that the

[1] Lambeth Conference, 1948. S.P.C.K. 5s.

marriage of true science and true religion is one of the most urgent needs of our time. Nevertheless, the two meetings were concerned with widely different human interests. The worlds from which their members came, and to which they have returned, are far apart, and the connecting bridges are few.

THE DEPENDENCE OF MANKIND ON SCIENCE

The presidential address of Sir Henry Tizard was a comprehensive survey of the urgent practical problems in the world to-day which science may help to solve. The speaker was exceptionally qualified to present such a picture, not only as a scientist familiar with the developments of scientific thought, but as one who has been engaged for many years in scientific administration and the organization of research. He presides over committees concerned with broad scientific policy and the direction of scientific research to desirable public ends. No one is in a better position to enlighten us about the relation of science to the public good.

Sir Henry Tizard contrasted the position which science enjoys to-day with the low esteem in which it was held a century ago. It stands higher in the public estimation than it has ever done before. Public men in England now display a touching but alarming faith in the power of science to solve any national problem, however serious.

Rejecting all discussion of science in the abstract, he invited his audience to focus their attention on the actual predicament of the world to-day. All social progress, such as the spread of education, the promotion of health, opportunities for leisure and healthy recreation, must depend on the power of science and technology to increase the productivity of industry. The main part of the address was devoted to showing the results which would follow from a serious attempt to apply the knowledge we already have in such fields as the production of coal, the development of aeronautics, the prevention of disease in plants and animals as well as in human beings, the production of food and colonial development. The future of mankind depends on

the determined and successful application of the knowledge at our disposal to the solution of these vital problems.

We live in difficult times, Sir Henry concluded, but they are very interesting times, and difficulties are bracing to a nation which has not lost the resilience of youth. This is a time for adventure; for taking risks. If such risks are boldly taken, it may well be that at some future meeting of the British Association the President, reviewing the progress of the nation from the depths of bankruptcy to new and unsurpassed heights of prosperity, may justly claim that the chief cause of the change was that we had found the right way to combine originality in science with enterprise and speed in its application.

THE LAMBETH REPORT AND THE NATURE OF MAN

From this we may turn to the Lambeth Report. A considerable part of it is concerned with the pastoral responsibilities of the Anglican Communion and with its relations with other Christian Churches, and what is said under these heads does not belong to the present discussion. The main theme of the Conference, however, was the Christian doctrine of man, and its bearing on the attitude of the Church to human rights, to war, to the modern State, to Communism and to education.

The question of what man is and of the meaning of his existence is forcing itself more and more into the foreground. It concerns churchmen and scientists alike. It lay outside the theme of Sir Henry Tizard's speech; but it came into the discussions of sectional meetings of the British Association. The great new fact in the growth of modern science is that man himself has become the object of scientific investigation. For a long period man's energies were absorbed in discovering the secrets of nature and in gaining power over it. Man, the investigator, was for the most part taken as a fixed quantity. It is now realized that the patterns of human behaviour, individual and social, can be studied by the methods of science, and that by means of the knowledge thus acquired they can be modified and in increasing degree controlled. A new prospect opens up of a vast trans-

formation of man and society. It seems as though, not only the external conditions of human life but the whole course of history might be brought progressively under conscious human control.

The Lambeth Conference was, therefore, dealing with the central problem of human existence, when it set out to propound a doctrine of man. Its treatment of the subject is clear and forceful and related to the contemporary situation. No one can charge the bishops with blindness to what is going on in the world. *Nature*, in an editorial article, says that the Report " provides evidence of a changed attitude and outlook on the part of the Churches that would have seemed startling indeed to the Victorians ", and that its " frankness, clarity and logic may well astonish many men of science ". To have drawn so cordial a response from the leading scientific journal in this country shows that a common talking point has been found between the Church and men of science. It would be foolish to underestimate the value of that achievement. On the other hand, it would be rash to assume that the editorial comment in *Nature* represents the attitude of scientists generally, and in particular of the younger generation, towards the contents of the Lambeth Report, if they were to read it. To have gained a talking point, moreover, is only a beginning. If we have regard to the actual state of opinion in the world to-day, we must recognize that the view of man set forth in the Lambeth Report is hotly disputed in the widest circles, and that many deep questions have still to be settled before it can be said, as the editorial in *Nature* optimistically declares, that " science and religion stand on the same side in the defence of freedom and the moral, spiritual and cultural values of civilization ".

In brief outline, which necessarily does less than justice to a carefully worded and balanced statement, the Christian view of man expounded in the Lambeth Report is as follows :—

Christianity gives us the right to believe in man and to accept with reverence and gratitude the victories and achievements of man's spirit. It accordingly endorses every

claim that can rightly be made for man. It does not undervalue the material presuppositions of the good life. It is a mis-statement of the Christian case to contrast Marxian materialism with the spirituality of Christianity. As Archbishop Temple used to say, Christianity is the most materialistic of religions. Its quarrel with Marxian materialism is that the latter denies any other reality.

The foundation of all Christian thought about the world and man's place within it is the sovereignty of the living God as Creator and Ruler of the universe. On God man depends for his existence; all his powers and capacities are God-given, held in trust for the service of God's will.

As creature, man is a child of nature and as such is rightly regarded as the object of scientific inquiry. Christianity welcomes without reserve the findings of scientific investigation by the natural and social sciences into men's psychophysical constitution. But science cannot give a complete account of man because man not only is part of the natural order but also reaches out beyond it. He is able to respond to God's self-communication to him and to act as a person responsible to God. As a spiritual being he reaches out beyond earthly frontiers towards a goal in some order of reality which is not confined within space-time dimensions. Only within a theistic world view can personal life find any true validity.

Man has always been conscious of the moral contradiction in his own nature. Fundamentally the meaning of sin is self-centredness—man's refusal to acknowledge his dependence on his fellow men and on God. The crucial problem of this generation is not merely the individual problem of personal forgiveness of sin. The devastating experience of our own age has brought home to us the fact that the war against evil in our own souls is but part of a vast and cosmic warfare against spiritual hosts of wickedness. The whole course of history has become deranged. None the less, in the Christian view the world is still God's, even in its sin. God remains sovereign in His world; life and goodness have the final word in it. In the keeping of God man's life is safe whatever the circumstances of this world. No moral fidelity is wasted,

no spiritual loyalties are lost. Apart from the conviction of life eternal the Christian interpretation of man breaks down and human experience is self-contradictory. The virtual fading-out of this dimension from the contemporary western consciousness, and indeed very largely from the consciousness of Christians, impoverishes life to a degree which it is hardly possible to exaggerate.

So much for the Lambeth statement. Taken as a whole, and within the imposed limits of length, it could not easily be bettered. Why is it, then, that in spite of this, and of the warm welcome from *Nature*, it still leaves us with a certain sense of dissatisfaction and a feeling that the real problems have not yet been solved—not even, perhaps, fully faced? To find the explanation we have to probe deeper than the statement itself.

THE NATURE OF MAN AND THE NEW KNOWLEDGE

However true it may be that biology, physiology, psychology and other sciences can give a valid account of particular aspects of man's behaviour, but can never give a full or true account of man himself, because he is a being who transcends the natural order, the question has still to be asked whether the Church as a whole has taken adequate account of what these sciences have to tell us about man. It is certainly not without Christian theologians, teachers and preachers who have assimilated the results of modern knowledge and allowed them to shape their thinking and preaching. But they are too few in number, and it must be recognized that the ordinary presentation of Christianity has been in very small degree influenced by the new knowledge. That is the question which troubles the thoughtful man in the street.

It would be quite unfair to criticize the Lambeth Report for failing to do what could not possibly be done in the space. But one of the reasons why statements of this kind coming from ecclesiastical sources are apt to fall on deaf ears is the suspicion that in general the Church, instead of undergoing the labour of assimilating the new knowledge and taking account of it in its teaching, takes the easier and more

indolent course of continuing to present its teaching in the traditional forms in which it was given before the biological, ethnological and psychological sciences had made their far-reaching discoveries. Can we assert that the suspicion is without grounds ? Is it not, broadly speaking, true that not only ordinary preaching, but theological thinking as a whole, the training of the ministry, clergy conferences and the general outlook of the Church are insulated from scientific thought which shapes and colours the mentality of our time ?

Man belongs to the natural order, says the Lambeth Report, *but* he is also spirit. Quite true, the scientist might reply ; but my difficulty is that you reach your " but " too quickly—you take off your hat in passing to the natural order and hasten at once to transfer the discussion to the " category of the personal ". If the Christian preacher is to receive attention, it must be known that, when he talks about man, he is speaking about man with his hormones and glands and reflexes and complexes and social context, all of which have a powerful effect in determining not only his abnormal behaviour but also his virtues ; that he has before his eye the same man that the doctor, the psychiatrist, the educator and the sociologist are dealing with. He must know that some of that man's real needs can be met more effectively by them than by himself. In short, the mere acknowledgement that man is part of nature is not enough. If what is said in the Lambeth Report is to obtain a real hearing, the Church must convince men that it has a real understanding in the light of modern knowledge of what that acknowledgment means.

THE TEST OF TRUTH

That is one essential, but it is only half the battle. If men are to take seriously the Christian doctrine of man, a no less revolutionary effort is needed to put content into the other assertion that man is related to a spiritual reality that transcends nature.

Sir Henry Tizard's speech was marked by a deep seriousness. Do these things, he said in effect, or you will perish.

Apply with unremitting effort the knowledge which science puts at your disposal, or be prepared to face a calamitous lowering of the standard of living, wide-spread starvation and increasing and endless misery. If these dangers are to be averted, the responsibility is one which men must take squarely on their own shoulders; their fate is in their own hands.

Can it be said that the Churches, for which the bishops assembled at Lambeth speak, take with equal seriousness their own doctrine of man? We pick up by chance, as we write this News-Letter, a copy of a diocesan gazette. What does it contain? Three articles consisting largely of funny stories of the second-rate variety with which attempts are made to enliven the dullness of clerical and secular social gatherings, an article entitled " The Living Church ", including such trivialities as how to draft a church poster announcing a forthcoming dance with the minimum number of words, two excerpts from American magazines assumed to have a certain raciness—that is practically all, apart from a letter from the bishop describing the externals of the Lambeth Conference and giving one or two items of church news. Not a single article instructing the readers about the great themes of human life and destiny. How does that comport with the assertion of the Lambeth Report already quoted that the fading out of the dimension of eternal life has impoverished life to a degree that cannot be exaggerated? It would indeed seem that the dimension had faded out, as the Report suggests, from the consciousness, not only of men generally, but also of Christians.

The illustration is no more than a minor symptom of a grave weakness and shortcoming in the Christian life of to-day. From the Christian point of view the most serious fact in the religious situation is the emergence and rapid spread of new forms of atheism. The question we are now raising is, of course, quite separate from that of science. Many scientists in the past and present have been devout Christians. But underlying the prodigious, world-wide activity in the pursuit of science and technology, which is to-day the main preoccupation of mankind, is the funda-

HOLBROOK LIBRARY

mental question whether in carrying out these tasks man in his solitariness is shaping his own destiny or is devoting powers that have been entrusted to him to the service and worship of God.

The point about modern atheisms is that they are not speculative doubts about the existence of God leading to a mainly negative conclusion. They are the expression of a positive attitude to life. At the root of them lies the conviction that dependence on deity is incompatible with the dignity, freedom and responsibility of man. As Père Lubac has pointed out in his brilliant book, *Le drame de l'humanisme athée*,[1] the Christian message of man's filial relation to God, which came to the ancient world as the awakening of an immense hope and a mighty deliverance from the tyranny of pitiless fate, is now felt to be a yoke. Man, it is held, has falsely attributed to an imaginary deity qualities that are part of his own essence. If he is to be fully man he must take squarely on his own shoulders his responsibility for the world. In the words of Sir Charles Sherrington (to whom Sir Henry Tizard paid a warm tribute as the sole survivor of the band of great scientists who at the turn of the century gave so powerful an impetus to scientific discovery), the new situation in which the human mind has no appeal and no resort for help beyond itself, may seem to enhance the tragedy and pathos of human life, but it is at the same time one "which transforms the human spirit's task, almost beyond recognition to one of loftier responsibility".[2] Or, as one of our younger poets, Dr. Alex Comfort, puts it in a recent article, we must hold that "beauty, justice and so forth exist as long as we assert them, not in the mind of God or any society, and that we are responsible for our actions".

What we are confronted with to-day in many quarters is a conscious attempt to order and organize the world on the explicit assumption that there is no God. It is a positive belief by which many to-day deliberately attempt to live, and some with deadly earnestness. In face of this, the task to which Christians have to address themselves is to discover

[1] Editions Spes, Paris, 1945. [2] *Man on His Nature*, p. 404.

and to demonstrate what difference belief in God makes to practical living. And this has to be done in a way that takes full account of man's freedom and responsibility—that does not, in easy fashion, shuffle off on God a responsibility which man is meant to bear, and which the brave take ungrudgingly on their shoulders for the sake of their fellowmen. The question at issue to-day between theism and atheism is not one to which the answer can be given in thought alone. It has to be proved in life.

As we do in many instances, we submitted a draft of this News-Letter before publication to a number of critics. In this case these included three or four bishops and a few scientists, from whom we received valuable suggestions. One of the critics, who might hesitate to call himself in the full sense a Christian, writes: "The second question (i.e. the paragraphs under the heading 'The Test of Truth') seems to me to be by far the more important. The question whether we save our individual souls and the question whether we preserve the human race alike depend not on whether we fully use our capacity for scientific thinking, but on whether we fully use our capacity for Christian loving."

THE SUPPLEMENT

Professor Karl Barth's address on which Dr. Niebuhr comments made a profound impression on the Amsterdam Assembly. It has been widely quoted in this country. It raised questions which are vitally important in the human situation which confronts us to-day. How far is man responsible for the state of the world? And how is his responsibility related to God's over-ruling providence? In different forms this question has perplexed the Church throughout its history. If Christians are truly aware of the powerful forces of the new atheisms to which we have already referred in this News-Letter, part of their response must be a fresh understanding of the relation of human endeavour to divine action and control. Professor Niebuhr states the issue with the utmost clarity.

Kathleen Bliss

WE ARE MEN AND NOT GOD

By REINHOLD NIEBUHR

BEYOND the traditional differences between confessions at Amsterdam the most marked theological difference apparent at the First Assembly of the World Council was between what was frequently described as "the continental theology" and what was with equal inaccuracy known as the "Anglo-Saxon approach to theology". Both designations were inaccurate because many continentals did not share the first approach; and the second was "Anglo-Saxon" only in the sense that beyond all denominational distinctions in the Anglo-Saxon world, it was united in its rejection of the first position.

The first position might best be defined as strongly "eschatological". This does not mean that it placed its emphasis primarily upon the hope of the culmination of world history in the second coming of Christ, the final judgment and the general resurrection. The position would be better defined in terms of "realized eschatology". Let Karl Barth's words outline the unique emphasis, since he was the most persuasive spokesman of this position. The assurance, declared Barth, that "Jesus Christ has already robbed sin, death, the devil and hell of their power and has already vindicated divine and human justice in his person" ought to persuade us "even on this first day of our deliberations that the care of the Church and the care of the world is not our care." Burdened with this thought we could straighten nothing out. For the final root of human disorder is precisely "this dreadful, godless, ridiculous opinion that man is the Atlas who is destined to bear the dome of heaven upon his shoulders".

No Christian would quarrel with the affirmation that the Church finds the true end and the new beginning of life and history in the revelatory and redemptive power of our Lord's life, death and resurrection. The questions arose at Amsterdam about the conclusions which were drawn from this article of faith. Did not these conclusions tend to rob the Christian life of its sense of responsibility? Did they not deal in an irresponsible manner with all the trials and perplexities, the judgments and

discriminations, which Christians face in the daily round of their individual and collective life?

The first conclusion which Barth drew from the Christian certainty that Christ had already gained the victory over sin and death was that "the care of the Church is not our care". We must rather commit the Church unto the Lord "who will bring it to pass". He has called us to be His witnesses, but not to be "His lawyers, engineers, statisticians and administrative directors". One is a little puzzled by this complete rejection of differentiated functions in the Church, since the precise point of St. Paul's classical chapter on the Church as the Body of Christ (1 Cor. 12), is that there are not only "diversities of gifts", but also "differences of administration" and "diversities of operation" within the Church. And St. Paul does have a "care" about the Church, which is very relevant to our present ecumenical task. His care is lest diversities of gifts and differences of administration tempt the "eye to say to the ear I have no need of thee". In other words he is afraid that special gifts and functions within the Church may become the occasion of the isolation of one member from another, rather than the basis for their mutual growth in grace. It is in this way that sin enters the Church and divides it. If these divisions are to be overcome, must there not be a contrite recognition of the sinful pride in our special gift or function by which we have become divided? What is that but "care" about the Church? The real weakness of this unvarying emphasis upon what we cannot do and upon what Christ has already done is that it tempts the Christian to share the victory and the glory of the risen Lord without participating in the crucifixion of the self, which is the Scriptural presupposition of a new life, for the individual, the Church and the nation.

We were warned by Barth with equal emphasis that the "care of the world is not our care". We are to beware lest we seem to present a kind of "Christian Marshall plan" to the nations. This is a wholesome warning against the pat schemes of Christian moralists. But does it not annul the Church's prophetic function to the nations? Must it not be busy in "the pulling down of strongholds, casting down imaginations and every thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and bringing into

aptivity every thought to the obedience of Christ" ? In such day as this we are particularly confronted with the fact that ıations and empires, proud oligarchies and vainglorious races ıave been " wounded " by the divine wrath in the vicissitudes ›f history and " have not received correction ". It is a sobering act that judgment so frequently leads to despair rather than to epentance. It is not within the competence of the Christian Church to change despair into repentance. That possibility is mystery of divine grace. But it does belong to the " care " ›f the Church for the world that it so interpret the judgments ınder which nations stand, and so disclose their divine origin, hat there be a possibility of repentance.

If the Gospel is made to mean merely the assurance of God's inal triumph over all human rebellion, it may indeed save men rom anxious worries ; but does it not also save them prema- urely from their perplexities ? It prevents them from indulging n the vainglorious belief that they can create the Kingdom of God by their own virtue. But does it remind them that they re workers together with Him ?

The second question one is forced to raise about this mphasis is whether it has any guidance or inspiration for Christians in the day to day decisions which are the very woof nd warp of our existence. Barth insists that we have no " systems of economic and political principles to offer the world ". We can present it only " with a revolutionary hope ". This emphasis has its limited validity. Christianity is too imply equated by many with some simple system of " Christian conomics " or " Christian sociology ". But he seems also to nean that we can, as Christians, dispense with the principles ›f justice which, however faulty, represent the cumulative xperience of the race in dealing with the vexing problems of nan's relations to his fellows. We ought indeed to have a greater degree of freedom from all, even the most hallowed, raditions, as we seek to establish and to re-establish com- munity in our torn world. But freedom over law cannot mean mancipation from the tortuous and difficult task of achieving tolerable justice. It is certainly not right for Christians to eave it to the " pagans " of our day to walk the tight-rope ›f our age, which is strung over the abyss of war and tyranny,

seeking by patience and courage to prevent war on the one hand and the spread of tyranny on the other; while they rejoice in "a revolutionary hope" in which all these anxieties of human existence are overcome proleptically. It is particularly wrong if we suggest to these pagans that we have no immediate counsel in the present perplexity but that we will furnish a "sign" of the "coming Kingdom" by some heroic defiance of malignant power, if the situation becomes desperate enough. We will not counsel any community that this or that course might lead to tyranny. We will merely prepare ourselves to defy tyranny when it is full blown.

Here there are suggestions of a "crisis" theology, but not with the connotation originally intended. It is only fair to Barth to acknowledge gratefully the great contributions which this theology made to the struggle against tyranny in recent decades. Its interpretation of the Christian faith helped to create an heroic heedlessness, a disposition to follow the Scriptural injunction: "Be careful for nothing". This resulted in a very powerful witness to Christ in the hour of crisis. But perhaps this theology is constructed too much for the crises of history. It seems to have no guidance for a Christian statesman in his day-to-day responsibilities. It can fight the devil if he shows both horns and both cloven feet. But it refuses to make discriminating judgments about good and evil, if the devil shows only one horn or the half of a cloven foot.

There is a special pathos in the fact that so many of the Christian leaders of Germany are inclined to follow this form of flight from daily responsibilities and decisions; because they are trying to extend the virtue of yesterday to cover the problems of to-day. Yesterday they discovered that the Church can be an ark in which to survive a flood. To-day they seem so enamoured of this special function of the Church that they have decided to turn the ark into a home on Mount Ararat and live in it perpetually.

Barth is as anxious to disavow any special responsibilities in our debate with a secular culture, on the edge of despair, as in our engagement with a civilization, on the edge of disaster. We are not to worry about this "godless" age. It is no more godless, he declares, than any other age; just as the evil in our

day is neither more nor less than that of any previous period. We seem always to be God, rather than men in this theology, viewing the world not from the standpoint of the special perplexities and problems of given periods, but *sub specie aeternitatis*.

In any event we are not to enter into debate with the secularism of our age. With a special dig at his old opponent Brunner, who had analysed the "axioms" of secularism to prove that they were filled with idolatry, Barth warned that we had nothing special to say to the godless people of our age which we would not have said in any age. What we have to say to them is that "Jesus Christ died and rose again for them and has become their divine brother and redeemer". Does this mean that St. Paul had no right to analyse the meaning of the yearning of his day for the "unknown God" and prove its relevance for the Gospel? When Mr. Julian Huxley, for instance, writes a book, *Man in the Modern World*, in which he manages to distil every error of modern man about himself and his destiny, his virtue and his wisdom, is the Christian apologist to refrain from every apologetic assault upon some of the absurdities of these modern beliefs? Is he merely to assure Mr. Huxley that Christ died for him, even though Mr. Huxley could not, in his present state of belief, possibly understand why anyone need die for us?

One sees that the Church is as rigorously prohibited from turning a furrow in the field of culture as in the field of social relations. Let the Church remain an ark, ready to receive those who are fleeing the next flood. If, meanwhile, weeds should grow in the garden of either culture or civilization that is not surprising, since the Church knows *a priori* that weeds grow in every human garden.

With the fullest appreciation of what this theology did to puncture the illusions of churchmen, theologians and moralists, one must insist that it does not expound the whole Gospel. It warned the Church rightly that it must bear witness, not to its own power, but to the power of God; not to its capacity to build the Kingdom of God, but to the Kingdom which has been established by divine grace.

But the Christian faith, which can easily degenerate into a too simple moralism, may also degenerate into a too simple determinism and irresponsibility when the divine grace is regarded as

a way of escape from, rather than a source of engagement with, the anxieties, perplexities, sins and pretensions of human existence. The certainty of the final inadequacy of the "wisdom of the world" must not be allowed to become the source of cultural obscurantism. The certainty of the final inadequacy of every form of human justice must not lead to defeatism in our approach to the perplexing problems of social justice in our day. The certainty that every form of human virtue is inadequate in the sight of God must not tempt us to hide our talent in the ground.

One of the tasks of an ecumenical movement is to prevent a one-sided statement of the many-sided truth of the Gospel. "Narrow is the way which leadeth unto life." There is an abyss on each side of that narrow way. Any one who is too fearful of the abyss on the one side, will fall into the abyss on the other side. We "Anglo-Saxons" who object to this one-sided emphasis may be corrupted by many Pelagian and semi-Pelagian heresies. We stand in need of correction. But we also have the duty to correct. We are embarrassed about making our correction because we cannot deny that this "continental" theology outlines the final pinnacle of the Christian faith and hope with fidelity to the Scriptures. Yet it requires correction; because it has obscured the foothills where human life must be lived. It started its theological assault decades ago with the reminder that we are men and not God; that God is in the heavens and that we are on earth. The wheel has turned full circle. It is now in danger of offering a crown without a cross, a triumph without a battle, a scheme of justice without the necessity of discrimination, a faith which has annulled rather than transmuted perplexity; in short, a too simple and premature escape from the trials and perplexities, the duties and tragic choices which are the condition of our common humanity. The Christian faith knows of a way through these sorrows, but not of a way around them.

Subscriptions—£1 ($4.00 in U.S.A. and Canada) for one year, 10s. 6d. for six months (Great Britain and Ireland only). Single copies, 10d.; reduction for quantities.

All communications and subscriptions should be sent to—
THE CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER, 20 BALCOMBE STREET, DORSET SQUARE, LONDON, N.W. 1

Published by the Christian Frontier Trust, Ltd., and printed in Great Britain by the Church Army Press, Cowley, Oxford.